

Application No.: 10/669940
Docket No.: CL2173USNA

Page 3

REMARKS

Claim 22 is being amended to insert a period at the end of the claim. Applicant apologizes for the typographical error in the Amendment filed June 10, 2005.

Claim 14 is being amended to recite that the metal oxide is disposed between and in contact with a source electrode and a drain electrode. This amendment introduces no new matter, and is supported in the specification as filed, *inter alia*, on page 9, lines 3-11.

Claims 16-21 are being amended to replace the language "described by" with "recited in", to conform to conventional patent terms.

Finality of rejection

Applicant respectfully submits that the finality of rejection of the present claims is premature. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Applicant's previous amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection, because Applicant's previous amendment was made only for clarity, and did not broaden the scope of the claims or introduce any new matter. Accordingly withdrawal of the finality of the rejection of the present claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 14, 17, 18 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by French et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,772,941. Claim 14, as presently amended, recites a transistor component comprising an undoped, transparent metal oxide disposed between and in contact with a source electrode and a drain electrode. In contrast, French discloses a transparent metal oxide as a conductive, electrode portion of a transistor. The present claims, by being drawn to a semiconductor, are distinct from and unanticipated by French. More particularly, French does not disclose or suggest a semiconductor component comprising an undoped, transparent metal oxide disposed between and in contact with a source electrode and a drain electrode. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14, 17, 18, and 23 are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of French.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over French. The Examiner asserts that French discloses the transistor of claim 14. However, as stated hereinabove, French does not disclose a semiconductor component comprising an undoped, transparent metal oxide disposed between and in contact with a source electrode and a drain electrode.

Application No.: 10/669940

Docket No.: CL2173USNA

Page 4

Claims 16, 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over French in view of Kim et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0085279. Applicant submits that, because the disclosure of Kim adds nothing to overcome the absence in French of any disclosure or suggestion of a semiconductor component as presently claimed, claims 16, 22 and 24 are not obvious in view French and/or Kim. Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that French and Kim disclose the use of transparent metal oxides in different applications from the specific use (semiconductor) of the metal oxides in the presently claimed invention.

Application No.: 10/669940
Docket No.: CL2173USNA

Page 5

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the amendment and allowance of claims 14 and 16-24 are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner decline to enter the present amendment, or should there be any remaining issues with regard to the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



GAIL A DALICKAS
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 40,979
Telephone: (302) 992-4947
Facsimile: (302) 992-5374

Dated: October 17, 2005